



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

peace between them. Ambassador Bryce, always a statesman of peace, alluding to the men at arms and the martial scenes around him, to the old cannon and rusty relics, declared himself nevertheless to be "a man of peace." He could not but believe that the Creator meant this beautiful spot for something else than fighting, and he trusted that it would never see fighting again. He admired the courage of the French and the English who had fought at Ticonderoga, but he hoped that they would never, never do it again. President Taft, following the Ambassadors, and giving a brief review of the history of the Champlain valley, said that the battles which for two hundred years were fought there "were never to recur again." "I echo and emphasize," he said, "the statements of the Ambassadors, and repeat their prayer that never again may this great valley be given a name in history by reason of its being the seat of bloody war."

These noble utterances have much more significance than many are disposed to give to them. They are typical of the time and of the advanced stage which the movement for world peace has reached. It is easy enough to say that such speech is mere talk, mere celebration gush, and that it is all forgotten and discarded as soon as the occasion is past. Once this was often true; it is so no longer. Men like Taft and Root, Bryce and Jusserand do not indulge in mere gush. They say what they mean. The talk of such men is dynamic. It has a power for good that many do not appreciate. If they only keep on talking, and men like them in other countries keep on talking, as so many of them have been talking in recent years, they will ultimately be able to talk the possibility of war to death, and talk out of existence the huge armaments which now burden and torture the world. Many wars have been merely talked and written into existence in other days, when there was no real cause for them. Why may not peace, universal and permanent, be equally well talked and written into existence, even against the greatest obstacles? Such power has persistent human speech.

President Taft and the French and British Ambassadors have made three nations, or rather all the nations, their debtors by the sincere and courageous demand for unbroken peace uttered by them under the shadow of the old fort of Ticonderoga, where men once did each other to death in the fierce roar and rage of battle. Their words are the expression of more than a mere wish, more than a demand; they are a luminous prophecy of what is just before us; a fine interpretation of the course which the world is rapidly taking away from the brutalities and absurdities of war toward the final destiny of humanity — friendship and brotherhood, coöperation and peace — accompanied by a prosperity as yet undreamed of, an era of joy and happiness unbounded.

Let us have the statesmanship of peace everywhere and on all occasions.

### Frederick de Martens.

The death of Frederick de Martens of Russia, a member of the State Council, has taken away one of the leading and most influential of the workers for the organization of the world on a basis of law and peace. In the years preceding the first Hague Conference his service lay in the field of international law and as a representative of Russia in a number of important international conferences. He was the author of a number of valuable works on international law, professor of the subject at the University of St. Petersburg, and universally recognized as probably the foremost authority of the time in this field. He was sometimes called in Europe the Lord Chief Justice of Christendom.

Professor de Martens was one of the first to give international law its modern practical direction. He believed that, through treaties and conventions dealing with the various common interests of the nations, international law might be lifted out of its former vagueness and placed on such a basis of definiteness and positiveness as to make it an effective instrument in working out a practical union of the states. He thought that this was the aim which all workers in this field should set for themselves. In this direction he steadily worked himself, and had unusual opportunities to do so in the many international gatherings to which he was sent by his government. He was a member of the Brussels Conference of 1874, of the Red Cross Conference at Karlsruhe in 1887, of the Maritime Conference of 1889, of the Conference for the Suppression of the Traffic in Girls in 1890, and represented Russia in both the Hague Conferences.

He had large experience as an arbitrator. In 1897 he was a member of the board which settled the "Costa Rica" ship dispute between England and The Netherlands; in 1899 he was president of the tribunal which arbitrated the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela, and again in 1903 he was a member of the tribunal chosen from the Hague Court to settle the preferential payment controversy which had arisen in connection with the attempt of Great Britain, Germany and Italy to collect claims against Venezuela by force of arms.

When the Hague Court was established after the first Hague Conference, Mr. de Martens was made a member of it from Russia, and retained this position till the time of his death.

He was a leading figure in both the Hague Conferences, being ranked at the meeting of 1899 with Andrew D. White, Sir Julian Pauncefote, Mr. Auguste Beernaert and Léon Bourgeois. In the first, it was on his proposition that the provision for international commissions of inquiry was made a part of the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes — a provision which afterwards, in the Dogger Bank affair, stood his country in

such good stead. In the second Conference he threw the full weight of his influence in favor of a general treaty of obligatory arbitration, which failed because of the opposition of Germany, though it carried in its support no less than thirty-five of the forty-four delegations. After the calling of the second Hague Conference he was sent by the Russian government to visit all the capitals of Europe, with a view to promoting the best possible results from the Conference, and it was due in no small measure to this tour that the Conference was so great a success. During this visit he expressed the opinion that, though the subject of armaments had not been placed on the program of the second Conference by his government, it nevertheless was likely to be taken up, as it had been left over from the Conference of 1899 as unfinished business. He assured the various governments that the Czar had not in the least changed the views on the subject which he held in 1898, when he issued his call for the first Conference.

Mr. de Martens was very much opposed to the war between Russia and Japan, and did what was in his power to try to prevent it, by means of the good offices of other governments or otherwise. But for the haste of Japan in breaking off diplomatic relations and rushing into war, it is probable that he would have induced his government to appeal to the good offices of foreign powers to settle the questions at issue and prevent hostilities. He was afterwards sent as one of the Russian Commissioners to the Portsmouth Conference, through which the war was brought to a close. Here he did much, through his wide experience and wisdom, to make a pacific outcome possible.

It is not generally known that it was on the suggestion of Mr. de Martens that Mr. Carnegie made the great gift of a million and a half of dollars for the Palace of Peace at The Hague. But such is the fact. In an interesting article on Professor de Martens in the *Friedenswarte*, Mr. A. H. Fried publishes the following letter which he had received from Mr. de Martens in January, 1905, giving the facts as to the origin of the Peace Palace:

"As far as concerns the Arbitration Palace, its history is very simple. In December, 1899,—that is, just after the Hague Peace Conference,—I was asked by Carnegie, through W. Stead, to answer the following question: 'How could Carnegie best use his colossal fortune of forty million pounds for the good of humanity?' I wrote a letter in which I set before Carnegie that, in my judgment, he could best serve humanity by setting apart a fund for the building of a Palace for the Hague Court. The thought found fruitful soil. But with the help of my friends Andrew White, Holls and Anderson, I had to work three years for the realization of the thought. That is the history of the Palace."

Professor de Martens never came much, if at all, into touch with the peace societies and peace congresses, or

even with the Interparliamentary Union. Russia had no peace societies, and, being a non-constitutional monarchy, had no representatives in the Interparliamentary Union. But, in spite of the limitations thus imposed, he managed through his profession, through his wide diplomatic and arbitration service, and through the Hague Conferences, to make a contribution of the first order toward the establishment of peace throughout the world on a permanent judicial basis.

### The Bolivia-Peru Boundary Dispute.

The situation which has arisen in South America over the arbitration by the Argentine government of the Bolivia-Peru Boundary dispute is a most unfortunate one, whether it leads to actual hostilities or not.

So far as we recall, no such serious situation has ever before arisen in connection with any one of the more than two hundred and fifty arbitrations of the past century. In the case of the Northeastern Boundary controversy between this country and Great Britain, the award of the arbitrator, the King of The Netherlands, was not acceptable to the United States government, and was waived by both governments because the arbitrator had gone beyond competence and laid down another line than the one called for by the treaty. But this course gave rise to no bitterness, and the dispute was afterwards disposed of, with good feeling on both sides, under the Webster-Ashburton agreement. There was a great deal of criticism of the award of the Hague Court in the case of the Venezuela Preferential Payment controversy, when the three powers which had bombarded Venezuelan ports were allowed payment of damages before the other powers could receive anything. But no diplomatic complications arose. All the ten powers interested loyally accepted the judgment.

In the case before us the Bolivians have behaved in a very surprising way. The two governments had entered into a formal solemn agreement to submit the dispute to the arbitration of President Alcorta of Argentina and to accept his decision as final. The Congresses of both countries sanctioned the agreement. The question at issue was that of the famous Acre district, covering some two thousand square miles and rich in minerals, which has been for many years in dispute. The case had been complicated by the cession of a part of the district by Bolivia to Brazil, for ten million dollars, in face of the warning issued by Peru at the time that the territory was then in controversy and subject to arbitration. Brazil is thus inevitably involved in the trouble.

When the award of President Alcorta was announced in the Bolivian capital as being more favorable to Peru, though a part of the district was given to Bolivia, the Bolivian population everywhere began at once to express